

Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

letters were almost devoid of bitterness. This rupture with Weed, it should be added, had one unfortunate result in terminating the series of letters which throw light upon the history of the New York Whig party and show Fillmore in the midst of political intrigue as steadily loyal and strikingly lacking in personal ambition. This poise he kept to the end, even when condemning Lincoln's administration and voting for McClellan. On the whole, one derives from these papers an increased respect for the honest conservatism of the man's character and a deepened sense of his limitations as a statesman.

THEODORE CLARKE SMITH.

Jefferson Davis. By WILLIAM E. DODD, Ph.D. [American Crisis Biographies, edited by Ellis Paxson Oberholtzer, Ph.D.] (Philadelphia: George W. Jacobs and Company. 1907. Pp. 396.)

This is the eighth issue of the so-called American Crisis Biographies, of which the ninth, the life of Alexander H. Stephens by Louis Pendleton, has since appeared. Professor Oberholtzer, the editor of the series, stated in his announcement that it would be impartial in character, "Southern writers having been assigned to Southern subjects and Northern writers to Northern subjects", all belonging to that younger generation which has grown up since the close of the great struggle, and "thus assuring freedom from any suspicion of wartime prejudice". This is a somewhat violent assumption; as is more strikingly apparent in Bruce's Lee and Pendleton's Stephens than in the volume now under consideration. Throughout this life of the Confederate president Professor Dodd evinces two of the great essentials of a successful writer of biography. He is thoroughly sympathetic with his subject; and yet throughout judicial in tone. The critical attitude he has assumed towards Mr. Davis has, indeed, excited more or less adverse comment in what was once the Confederacy; but nevertheless Professor Dodd endeavors throughout to do discriminating justice to one whom he properly regards, and who will unquestionably hereafter be regarded, as a great historical character.

The author is not always accurate in his statements, as is apparent at several points in his account of the capture of Davis; and he sometimes indulges in rather sweeping generalizations. A marked example of this last is in his extraordinary statement (p. 47) that Mr. John C. Calhoun was during his long prominence in political life at Washington, lasting over forty years—from the War of 1812 to his death in 1850—"perhaps the only really prominent figure in the social and political life of the capital who was never known to drink to excess". Considering that James Monroe, J. Q. Adams, Andrew Jackson, Martin van Buren, John Marshall, Joseph Story, Winfield Scott, Lewis Cass, and divers others equally easy of mention, were during that period beyond question "really prominent figures in the social and political

life of the capital", such a statement certainly calls for revision in any subsequent edition of a political biography intended for popular reading. Again (p. 207), Professor Dodd makes another statement far too general in character. He there says, "however illogical it may appear, the country at large believed that any state had the right to secede when its special interests seemed to be in imminent peril." Referring as it does to the long period subsequent to the death of Chief Justice Marshall down to 1860, this statement will not bear an instant's critical examination. The "Union, it must and shall be preserved" attitude of Andrew Jackson towards Nullification alone disproves it. That it is true of certain of the states, more especially those which afterwards composed the Confederacy, might be conceded. It is unquestionably true of South Carolina as an individual state. It is not true, however, of the majority of the states, especially of those constituting the new North. The process of nationalization had there made much further progress than Professor Dodd seems to suppose. In dealing with the issues which led up to the War of Secession it is always to be remembered that the influences at work in the slaveholding states were of a character wholly different from those at work in the free states. Into the slave-holding states there was no large foreign immigration. But during the period succeeding the death of Marshall there was an enormous and ever-increasing tide of foreign life swarming into the free states, especially those of the Northwest. This immigration was largely Irish and German; and, to the German and the Irishman, the idea of a divided sovereignty was very much what the one God and Christ crucified were to the Greeks or to the Jews-foolishness or a stumbling block. State sovereignty was therefore, during the period between 1840 and 1861, a living reality in the South but a rapidly vanishing political theory in the North.

Turning, however, to the more interesting portion of Davis's life, that connected immediately with the War of Secession, the time has now unquestionably come when it can be looked at in a large way, as in a measure it is looked at by Professor Dodd, and certain conclusions reached which are not likely hereafter to be revised in any considerable degree. The question of the origin of the Confederacy, the theory under which secession was brought about, and the cause of its failure may be passed upon, and a verdict, fairly to be considered final, rendered. On what theory, based upon any hope of probable success, did the Confederate States secede from the Union? With what ability was the struggle for independence conducted? And what were the causes which most powerfully contributed to its failure? Was that failure foredoomed from the commencement, or was it due to circumstances in any way accidental or fortuitous? Jefferson Davis was the head of the Confederacy, and in his hands were reposed powers almost dictatorial. Was the failure due to any lack of capacity on his part? Or, so far as he was individually concerned, will the verdict of history be that, taken as a whole, he made the best fight possible?

There is no question that today, among the confederate-descended generation dwelling in the region which constituted the Confederacy, the second place in regard and confidence has been accorded to Davis. The first is unquestionably held by Lee. Throughout what was the Confederacy Lee is looked upon with affection and respect, and with an admiration accorded to no other political character since the day of Washington. He stands second among the great Virginians; if indeed not upon an equality with the greatest. It is somewhat otherwise as respects Davis. During the time immediately subsequent to the collapse of the Confederate cause he was held to a certain degree responsible for that collapse. It was attributed largely to his failure to grasp the possibilities of the situation; to make the best selection of agents; to avail fully of the resources of the South. Diplomatic errors, errors of finance, mistaken judgments as to men, were attributed to him. Reviewing, however, the whole field in the light of the fuller records now accessible, and from the standpoint of forty years later, it may confidently be said that these adverse judgments have undergone, and are now undergoing, material revision. It is today generally conceded that Jefferson Davis was not only a man of high character and great ability, but that he, so to speak, fought the Confederacy for all it was worth, that he was responsible for no very considerable error of judgment, and that the failure of the cause entrusted to him was due to inherent weaknesses which neither he nor any other man could have made good.

This Professor Dodd fairly shows in a presentation which is deserving of wide and thoughtful consideration, especially at the North.

CHARLES F. ADAMS.

The Reminiscences of Carl Schurz. Volume I. 1829–1852. Volume II. 1852–1863. (New York: The McClure Company. 1907. Pp. 406; 467.)

Is there another autobiographical or biographical work in the English language which presents greater contrasts, in matter and in manner, than this? The career of Carl Schurz was unique and one would expect a vast difference between the story of his youth and that of his mature manhood. We may make allowances for the fact that the scene of the first volume is his native land and that its events are the share of a hot-headed young man in an attempt at a revolution, whereas the second volume narrates his rise as a serious politician in a strange country and as a general in a civil war. But that accounts for the difference only partially. One has almost the feeling that the two volumes do not deal with the same man. Indeed, in the student at Bonn, in the aide-de-camp of Anneke at Kaiserslautern, pointing an empty pistol at a priest in a comic-opera arrest of the good man, in the daring rescuer of Kinkel from the penitentiary at Spandau—in the character thus portrayed there is not the slightest hint of the man he afterward